

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.:45818.00018

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 40 were pending when last examined. Claims 1 – 40 were rejected. Claims 1, 5 – 7, 11, 18, 37 and 38 are being amended. Claims 1 – 40 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

In section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 5 – 7, 11, and 38. Applicant is amending the claims accordingly. As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §112

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant is amending the claim accordingly and therefore requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 3, 7, 23 – 25, 27 – 28, 31 – 33, and 35 – 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,961,587 to Vilppula et al. Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 is patentable over Vilppula et al, by at least reciting:

A modular wireless device comprising:
a shell that contains non-wireless components, at least of one of which is system software; and
a cartridge that contains wireless components, at least one of which is protocol stack call-processing software; and
a means for the shell and cartridge to exchange information; and
a means for the modular wireless device to configure its operation based on said information.

Claim 1 is being amended to clarify the call processing software is a protocol stack (see paragraph 3 of the specification). As such, Vilppula et al. does not anticipate claim 1 as Vilppula et al. does not teach a protocol stack in the SIM card 24. Instead, Vilppula et al. teaches that

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.:45818.00018

telecom applications, such as WAP or GSM are in the SIM card 24. Further, the cellular software programs 30, 32, 34, and 36 are in the mobile terminal 10, not the SIM card 24. The cellular programs control communications with telecommunication or other networks. (See Column 5, lines 37 - 41). Therefore, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections. As claim 1 is allowable, its dependent claims should be allowable also at least by virtue of their dependency. Further, claims 37 and 38 should allowable, as well as their dependent claims, for reciting similar limitations.


Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

In sections 4 - 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 - 6, 8 - 22, 26, 29, 30, and 34. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency to allowable claims. As such, Applicant request withdrawal of the rejections.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Alfred Tom

Dated: 4/7/06
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By 
Aaron Winger
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,229

SHANGHAI/1031.1

10

BEST AVAILABLE COPY